

Waste Reduction Task Force

Waste Reduction Goal & Methodology Work Group #1

Third Meeting – January 18, 2007

Conference Call Summary

Work Group Members Participating: Lisa Williams, Charles Wood, Bruce Wood, Bill Yearwood, and Phillip Nappi.

Facilitator: Nick Lytle, TDEC

The group began discussion with topic of priorities for the goal. One idea was to worry less about a percentage goal; an example being the 25% goal; and focus more on a results oriented solution aimed specifically at promoting, creating, and facilitating the emergence of programs that will have the end result of decrease landfill tonnages. *An example would be to formulate ten specific waste programs then providing the liberty to the regions to pick and choose which programs are right for them.*

Other members of the group reiterated that it was still very important to have a quantifiable goal. Without a measurable goal to strive to obtain, compliance to a program based waste reduction plan would have to a measurement method. There was indecision on the exact way in which this would be measured. With some discussion on the problems associated with accurately measuring recycling rates of various sorts, members could agree on the following principals.

- Counties/Municipalities/Regions **can** accurately measure the tonnages and volumes of those waste reduction programs that they directly oversee.
- In most cases Class I landfill tonnages **can** be accurately obtained with county of origins.
- Waste disposal and recycling efforts of private entities **cannot** always be obtained. Often tonnages are missing from final reports. In large urban areas, complete collection of all activities can be impossible.

Based upon these principals, a statewide “per capita” disposal rate could be set for attainment as an indicator as to if waste reductions efforts placed forth by the task force are making positive gains on a decrease in landfilling practices. Furthermore the group was in agreement that public recycling programs over which regions did have control could also be used as a percentage of the municipal solid waste that is being diverted from landfilling.

The group was in agreement that whatever the task force decides; at minimum larger urban municipalities must be included in the goals and directly held to the same policies of the counties. All

were in agreement that in terms of waste reduction, different standards for different size cities was acceptable and needed to focus energy toward those areas producing the most waste.

Any incentives, especially monetary for adopting waste reduction initiative should be kept positive. By this, the group wanted to get away from harsh fines for noncompliance and focus on rewards. The focus of waste reduction policies should also be on job creation, the salvaging of material that can be sold, and emphasis of money saved on tipping fees to landfill.

One group member prepared a draft statement to be presented to the Task Force pertaining to the formation of the solid waste goals. During the call, the members modified its language and added some additional points to read as following:

- A) The 25% diversion goal instituted under the Solid Waste Act of 1991 has not significantly diverted material away from Class I landfills. Per Capita and total Class I waste disposal has increased since the Act was adopted. Allowing for Class III/IV landfills to be used as a diversion method should be replaced with a policy that material routed to Class III/IV landfills should instead be recycled and reused whenever possible.
- B) A comprehensive statewide solid waste stream analysis would be an invaluable tool both for this Task Force; but also for future solid waste policy making decisions. Although many regions, counties, and municipalities have worked diligently for years measuring and accounting for their solid waste programs, many questions still remain such as:
 - a) Composition of waste entering Class I and Class III/IV landfills.
 - b) The waste streams of our State's businesses and institutions.
 - c) The amounts of various commodities being landfilled which have potential for reuse.
- C) Our Committee and the Solid Waste Task Force should seek to design specific programs which divert materials away from all landfills to demonstrate that solid waste:
 - a) Can create jobs
 - b) Can make profits
 - c) Can be reused to conserve our valuable natural resources.

Good solid waste policies will make garbage disappear through the free market.

Outside the scope of goal formulation but directly related to waste reduction the group thought that Class III/IV landfills should within their permitting process be required to produce a plan of action of how they will strive to recycle various parts of their received waste stream. With this requirement, these landfills would also be required to accurately keep record of waste origin and tonnages. Scales would be required for this which could be funded through accessed surcharges on their tipping fees. Tipping fee

surcharges could also be used to supplement programs aimed at recycling Class III/IV landfill materials. Grants produced from these fees must be available to both public and private entities.

The group spent the last portion of the meeting addressing the “Targeted Questions” which we were asked to address. Many of these questions were already addressed within our initial discussion. Highlights of these questions are below:

- All landfilling should be regarded the same with the exception for the Class III/IV landfills which strive to recycle a certain portion of their materials. These programs should be given credit for their efforts.
- Class III/IV landfills must have scales, better reporting, and be more accountable for their waste stream. This should be part of the permitting process.
- Class III/IV landfills could be access a surcharge, but only if that surcharge is used directly for the net benefit of waste reduction efforts.
- C&D Deposit systems is an issue for municipalities, namely urban areas. The State could provide incentives and education for this.
- Landfill bans are not out. Items such as yard waste, white goods, and organics need further consideration. Complete bans might be an issue for only larger urban areas. Yard Waste bans might be extended for the entire state. Contamination rate of 10% would be needed. Problems with implementation and enforcement still need to be explored. Local government should have the autonomy to ban materials if they choose and have the infrastructure for alternative handling of the material.
- Municipalities must be held equally accountable for all solid waste goals if they are to achieve success. Municipalities hold the majority of the population and the waste. If they are not on board, any efforts will fail.